DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 293 194 EA 019 782

AUTHOR Johnston, Bill J.; Holliday, James R.
TITLE Evaluating School Principal Performance: The North Carolina Quality Assurance Program for Administrators.
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration (Gatlinburg, TN, November 9, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; *Administrator Role; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; *Job Performance; *School Administration
IDENTIFIERS *North Carolina

ABSTRACT

The North Carolina Principal's Performance Appraisal Instrument is one attempt to extend evaluation from teachers to administrators. This report describes the proposed instrument, summarizes its development, and critiques its underlying logic. The appraisal instrument has several methodological limitations or omissions, including (1) insufficient evidence that specified competencies are necessary and sufficient to produce desired outcomes; (2) neglect of interactive effects between role competencies and role positions; (3) failure to specify contextual factors likely to affect role performance; (4) inherent contradictions involved in evaluating functions and competencies using the same analytic strategies; and (5) conceptual confusion regarding presumptions of superior performance based on evaluating minimal competencies. These deficiencies may be attributed to conceptualizations of schools as simple technical systems and principals as managers. Consistent with a technical rationality premise, the North Carolina instrument attempts to evaluate performance in 12 administrative functions and 69 competencies. Weaknesses of this approach include assumptions that the identified functions/role competencies exist as discrete entities, neglect of specification issues, and disregard of social and situational factors affecting administrative activity. Obviously, a more integrated, sociologically grounded conceptualization of administration is needed. Administrator evaluation should be viewed fundamentally as an analytical rather than a technical activity. Included are an appendix outlining the appraisal instrument and 20 references. (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED293194

EVALUATING SCHOOL PRINCIPAL PERFORMANCE: THE NORTH CAROLINA QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM FOR ADMINISTRATORS

Bill J. Johnston

James R. Holliday

University of North Carolina at Wilmington

Wilmington, North Carolina

EA019782

Paper prepared for the annual meeting of the

Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration.

Gatlinburg, Tennessee: November 1987

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James R. Holliday

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EVALUATING SCHOOL PRINCIPAL PERFORMANCE: THE NORTH CAROLINA QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM FOR ADMINISTRATORS

Bill J. Johnston

James R. Holliday

Recent commentators on the condition of education in America have noted the apparent policy shift from issues of equality to quality (Boyer, 1983; Goodlad, 1984, Shor, 1986). This shift may be understood as a response to the perceived educational crisis currently facing the nation. Melioritive strategies to confront the crisis have invoked the rhetoric of increased efficiency, effectiveness and standards (Education Commission of the States, 1983; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). As one response to the many national commission reports, many legislative bodies and state departments of education have initiated educational reform efforts, many of which include evaluation programs designed to reassure the public that educators are accountable and posses minimal role competencies. For example, only Alabama and Iowa do not have some form of teacher testing prior to initial certification. In addition, Georgia, Florida, Oklahoma, North Carolina, South Carolina, Kentucky and Virginia have beginning teacher programs which include classroom observation and evaluation as a precondition for continuing certification (Sandefur, 1987; Education Week, 1987). In formulating education reform proposals and in identifying the specific instructional competencies to be evaluated many states have been influenced by the "effective schools literature". Given that this literature supports consideration of the principalship as a pivital role in generating positive educational outcomes, it is not surprising then that some attention has been directed toward evaluation of principals' role performance in ways analogous to the evaluation of teachers.

There are a number of reports cataloging the various competencies that principals must posses to be effective (e.g., Lyons, 1981; Klopf, 1982; Duke and Stiggins, 1985). Nevertheless, there are few attempts to operationalize these competencies in a manner which could lead to objective evaluation (Culbertson, Henson, Morrison, 1974; Tucker, 1984). Thus the attempt by the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction (SDPI) to develop a principal performance appraisal instrument for statewide use should be of general interest. This report attempts to describe the background of development of the North Carolina

Principal Performance Appraisal Instrument; describe the proposed instrument; and offer critique of the underlying logic of the proposed instrument.

BACKGROUND

House Bill 1567, Section 5 of the 1984 Session of the General Assembly of North Carolina, directed the State Board of Education to develop a quality assurance program for all administrators by March 1, 1986. This bill is a further development of the educational reform movement in the legislature which has already produced the Teacher Quality Assurance Program (established in 1978) which includes the Initial Certification Program, Career Development Program, and Teacher Performance Appraisal System. The quality assurance program for administrators is predicated on the desire to ensure accountability among school administrators. Consistent with other accountability movements, one may expect evaluation of administrators to be a prominent feature.

The State Board of Education, in accordance with the action of the General Assembly, appointed a 48-member Task Force to (1) review the existing guidelines for preparation of administrators and curriculum-instruction specialists; (2) review the competencies that currently provide the basis for certifying administrators and curriculum-instruction specialists; (3) make recommendations regarding revisions that must be made in the competencies and guidelines for preparation in each of these certification areas; and (4) make recommendations regarding appropriate required experience during the initial certification period. This work was intended to inform the SDPI in reviewing certification requirements and developing a performance appraisal instrument.

The Task Force was appointed so that each educational region and congressional district was represented. A wide variety of job categories within the educational setting were represented in the Task Force: superintendent, assistant/associate superintendent, supervisor/coordinator/director, principal, assistant principal, teacher, representatives from institutions of higher learning, and members of local boards of education. The members were assigned to serve on one of four subcommittees: Overall Coordination, Competencies, Residency/Internship, or Service Delivery.

The Task Force began work in September of 1984 with the staff of the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction handling the day to day operations (meeting times, places, mailing, etc.). A Consultant from the Appalachian Research Center was hired by the State Board of Education in February of 1985 to

produce a literature synthesis on effective schools which was completed in June of 1985.

The Task Force concluded their work with a report to the State Board of Education in December, 1985. In this report the Task Force identified four generic functions, fifteen competencies and fifty-two behavioral indicators of effective administrators. Most of the behavioral indicators included in the Task Force report were drawn from a SDPI evaluation instrument developed in 1978. Recommendations for preservice training, internship, and initial certification of administrators and curriculum instruction specialists were also included in the Task Force Report (1985).

From the Task Force Report, the State Board of Education prepared a summary report and submitted it to the North Carolina General Assembly on February 14, 1986. In this summary report, the State Board of Education recommended to the General Assembly that the Quality Assurance Program for Administrators be fully implemented statewide.

A major reorganization in the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction in 1986 resulted in the creation of the new Division of Personnel Relations (DPR) under the Department of Personnel Services. The consultant who had developed the Task Force literature review was hired as the new division's director. Two components of the Quality Assurance Program have currently been developed by DPR staff. One is the Initial Certification Program, which is a two year probationary period for beginning administrators, accompanied by performance evaluation, successful completion of which allows an administrator to receive a continuing certificate. The initial certification component will be field-tested during fiscal years 1988 and 1989 prior to statewide implementation in July, 1989. The other component is the Principal Performance Appraisal Instrument, which is to be used to assess the performance of newly certified and experienced principals. This instrument incorporated the functions and competencies identified by the Task Force Report and was submitted to the State Board of Education in September, 1986. The performance appraisal component is currently being field-tested in six school districts state-wide.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NORTH CAROLINA QUALITY ASSURANCE INSTRUMENT

Development of the Principal's Performance Appraisal instrument by the DPR has progressed through several stages. The first stage involved review of the evaluation instrument developed by SDPI in 1978 which was being used in a few

school districts throughout the state. A second stage involved the attempt to integrate the recommendations of the Task Force with this evaluation instrument. A final stage involved the attempt to produce a single, revised instrument for statewide use.

Previous Evaluation Instrument

Prior to 1978, evaluation instruments did exist for administrators and curriculum specialists, but varied in scope and purpose among school systems in North Carolina. One perceived limitation of these instruments for general statewide use was that each was designed to measure performance within a specific district. Responding to the desire for a standard evaluation instrument, the SDPI had attempted in 1978 to produce a single instrument that could be used statewide for all administrators and curriculum specialists. SDPI began this process by requesting current administrators to generate a list of practices they engaged in that they thought were essential to managerial effectiveness. The SDPI then combined administrators responses into a single list. The administrators were then asked to rate those practices they thought were most important. This information was tabulated by SDPI and used to produce an instrument of "measurable" managerial competencies. This instrument was not widely accepted by school districts. Nevertheless, it was later used by the Task Force to generate it's list of fifty-two "behavioral indicators."

Several methodological and conceptual limitations of the 1978 instrument soon became apparent. First, the identification of managerial competencies was not organized into a coherent framework to improve administration. Instead, identified competencies remained at the level of a shopping list of current practices. Second, by depending upon practitioners to identify current practices of administration, unmediated by rational administrative theory, extant practices (and malpractices) were perpetuated by the evaluation instrument. If one assumes that extant school practices are in need of reform (if they are not why take any legislative action), then an instrument derived from ongoing practices is as likely to be a retrogressive as a progressive force relative to educational reform. Third, many of the behavioral indicators contained more that one action verb which made evaluation difficult and inconsistent. Finally, the instrument was not consistent with more sophisticated evaluation programs already in place in some school districts. If true educational reform was to occur, there was a need for a more theoretically grounded instrument.

Development of the Current Evaluation Instrument

Consistent with the approach established by the Task Force, DPR staff continued the emphasis on the four "generic" management functions: planning, implementing, supervising, and evaluating. In addition, three general roles of the principalship were identified: instructional leadership, resource management, and communications. These roles were considered to reflect the job demands of research knowledge, law and policy, and practice, respectively. Combining these functions and roles produced a matrix of twelve cells. Each cell was thought to represent a different functional area.

Analysis of the list of indicators contained in the 1978 evaluation instrument and included in the Task Force report, revealed that about half of these indicators could be placed in cells related to instructional leadership while the remainder were about equally distributed between resource management and communication. It should be noted that some cells contained few or no items. In these cases DPR staff were forced to add items to the original pool (Holdzkom, 1986). From this analysis the DPR was able to generate the performance appraisal instrument currently proposed for statewide adoption (see Appendix A). Examination of this instrument will indicate that the twelve cells of the functions/role matrix are represented in the instrument as the "twelve major functions of the principalship". The competencies considered to be indicative of each function are grouped under that function area. In specifying competencies the DPR expanded the original list of fifty-two competencies to sixty-nine.

One should note that a terminological shift has occurred. The Task Force had used the term "indicators" to refer to administrative practices identified in the original SDPI evaluation instrument. An indicator is typically considered to refer to a relatively specific factor which may be observed and measured. It is thought to stand for, or indicate the presence of, a phenomena not directly observable. DPR refers to the indicators identified by the Task Force as competencies. This is appropriate given the level of abstraction of the so-called indicators. Nevertheless this also represents a reconceptualization of the focal phenomena. One may not properly utilize the same strategies to evaluate specific indicators and general competencies.

In essence, the newly developed instrument for appraisal of principal performance is not really a new instrument at all. The substantive focus of the competencies to be evaluated are the same as those contained in the original

1978 instrument. The items have been reconstructed to eliminate having two or more action verbs in the same evaluation item. This is clearly a technical improvement. In addition, the competencies have been reorganized by use of the function and role matrix which does contribute to clarity of purpose. Problems do, however, remain inherent in the reconstituted instrument. It is these limitations we will now address.

CRITIQUE

There are any number of ways to approach the task of critique of the principal's performance appraisal instrument. One is to attempt to determine if the instrument is likely to consistently attain the desired objectives. This represents essentially a methodological evaluation. Another is to examine the fundamental assumptions of the nature of administration and evaluation implicit in the evaluation instrument. This represents an epistemological form of critique.

At the methodological level, several aspects of the proposed evaluation instrument are noteworthy. First, there appears to be confusion regarding whether one is evaluating minimum competencies or functions. This does not represent merely a terminological ambiguity.

Function is a concept related to issues of consequence. To determine function served, one is less interested in the particular acts producing an outcome than in the contribution of the outcome to attainment of desired goals. The DPR does not address the issue of educational goals. This is a serious weakness. Since there is no specification of desired educational goals, there is no basis for assessing the contribution (i.e., function) of administrators' planning, implementing, supervising, and evaluating activities to the attainment of educational goals. One is left with the sense that DPR is attempting to separate analysis of purposive administrative action from the issue of administrative purpose; that educational administration is to be considered an administration of means in the absence of goals.

Competency is a concept related to issues of practice; prescribed outcomes are presumed to follow from the skilled performance of specified acts. Assessment of competency presumes that acts and outcomes are generally known and causally related. DPR attempts to assess the minimum competencies of administrators. Since one is considered to either possess or fail to possess minimum competency it makes no sense to rate one's degree of minimum competency. Nevertheless, in the context of political concern with accountability, one may reasonably assume that

the principal performance appraisal process is intended to assess varying degrees of superior performance. If this is the case, and if one has established that particular behaviors are causally connected to particular outcomes, then one may reasonably attempt to prescribe and measure behavioral indicators of a competency through an observational rating scheme. One remains faced with the task, however, of determining superior administrative performance on the basis of assessed minimum competencies everyone is expected to have mastered. DPR does not address this issue in development of the performance appraisal instrument.

A second methodological issue relates to analysis of multiple competencies contributing to functional areas and to the interaction between various competencies. If one is interested in complex functions (for example the first "function" of the evaluation instrument, "development of a comprehensive instructional plan") then one may presume that a variety of different competencies in combination are necessary for the function to be served. It is unlikely that one may assess such interactions through use of a competency rating scheme as proposed in the evaluation instrument. Indeed the separation of administration into twelve role/functional areas, each of which is to be rated independently, and the absence of structured provision within the rating instrument for consideration of the relationship between competencies virtually precludes analysis of multiple causation or interaction effects.

Finally one may identify limitations related to the assumption of generic functions. One may assume that all administrators must perform activities associated with planning, implementing, supervision, and evaluation. Nevertheless, it seems rather peculiar to consider administration to be constituted by a set of generic acts. Consider a function like supervision. Is one to assume that it makes no difference whether a principal is supervising a faculty of twenty elementary teachers or a faculty of eighty high school teachers? Both common sense and organizational research indicates that increase in the size and/or nature of an organization has consequence for social relations and production activities (Hall, 1977). Thus at the level of evaluation one would not expect to find administrators engaged in generic acts corresponding to generic functions. The evaluation instrument offers no guidance for making a distinction between these levels of analysis.

Perhaps one reason for the lack of distinction between generic functions and competencies is that there is no attempt to include consideration of

contextual factors in the evaluation. For example, ignored are issues of building and district size, grade level (elementary, middle school, or high school), socioeconomic status of the student population, and region (rural, suburban, urban). While these factors may not alter assumptions about generic functions, they would certainly effect administrative style and behavior. They would also effect evaluation using an observation checklist.

It appears then that a number of methodological limitations are present in this instrument. In our judgement these limitations are serious but may be resolved through clarification of ambiguity between function and competency, by identifying goals, and by recognizing the influence of contextual factors like size and grade level. There are issues related to this instrument, however, that cannot be so easily resolved. These issues involve fundamental assumptions about the organization, operation, and function of schools as well as the nature of administration and leadership within schools. We may describe these as epistemological issues.

One's image of what constitutes educational administration is significant in determining the types of evaluation systems considered to be appropriate. Traditionally educational administration has been considered a specialty area within the general field of management science. This is the image of educational administration adopted by the Task Force and continued by DPR through search for generic functions. Typical of the management science approach is examination of managerial "behaviors" with the intention of discovering regularities and laws of management. The presumption is that organizations are technical systems and that management of organizations requires the application of specified techniques. Within such a view, training is complete when the future administrator has acquired a specified set of techniques or competencies; evaluation is then concerned with the observation of managers employing these techniques. The form of development of the principal appraisal instrument is analogous to industrial task analysis derived from scientific management approaches. It is also subject to the same limitations: disaggregation of parts, limitation to behavioral dimensions, neglect of mediating personality attributes, neglect of context and social dynamics. In general, industrial task analysis proved useful only for the most routine and repetitive physical activities. It proved consistently ineffective for addressing cognitive activities like supervision and management.

While there does exist a technical component to educational administration, educational administration is not simply technical. It also involves social, political, economic and value orders. These orders are generally recognized by practicing administrators as highly significant factors constraining the exercise of technical principles. Most recent descriptions of school administration caution against approaches which reduce analysis to a single dimension, whether it be the technical, social, political, or value orders (e.g., Kimbrough and Nunnery, 1976; Silver, 1983; Haller and Strike, 1986). Instead, analysis and evaluation should attempt to be integrative. The implication of adopting an integrative approach to understanding educational evaluation is the necessity of reconsidering the logic of evaluation of administrators.

One fundamental requirement of any evaluation system is that it be grounded in rationality. While such a statement is so obvious that it constitutes a truism, the nature of what constitutes rationality can be problematic. In the study of organizations two forms of rationality are dominant: technical and substantive rationality (Brubaker, 1984; McIntosh, 1983).

Technical rationality represents the consideration of the efficacy of a particular means in achieving a desired goal. If the means succeed in attaining the goal, ipso facto the action is considered rational. The reason to employ this form of rationality is to increase the calculability and control of action to obtain desired goals. An action which has proven effective in the past may be repeated or prescribed in similar circumstances.

Substantive rationality is less concerned with issues of calculability, prescription and control, and more concerned with issues of goal determination and attainment under conditions of uncertainty. Within the logic of substantive rationality, two issues emerge of considerable interest. The first is the presumption that, in most situations, there exists a variety of means to attain a particular goal. Second is the assumption that attempts to prescribe appropriate means will generally prove counter- productive except in the most routine situations. The value in this approach is to recognize that administration is fundamentally an analytic and creative act performed under conditions of ambiguity and uncertainty..

The principal performance appraisal instrument appears to be grounded upon utilization of a technical rational form of analysis and to ignore issues of substantive rationality. To employ technical rational forms of analysis, relative

to the performance appraisal program necessarily requires a presumption of a causal relationship between prescribed managerial behaviors (considered as means) and desired managerial outcomes. Moreover, one must also assume that organizational goals, structure and context remains relatively stable. Developers of the principal appraisal instrument recognize that most effective schools and management studies are based upon correlational studies which limits the ability to draw causal inferences (Holdzkom, 1986). Nonetheless, this limitation is ignored and research findings are treated as having established causal relationships. Moreover, in the context of change in the structure of public education represented by recent legislative initiatives (for example, implementation of the standard course of study and teacher performance appraisal programs), one should be cautious in the presumption of goal, structure, and contextual stability.

An evaluation instrument may be considered reasonable, within the parameters of technical rationality, only to the extent that two conditions are met. First, one must demonstrate the existence of a causal relationship between various managerial competencies and outcomes. If this condition is not met, there would be no point, of course, in evaluating the competency. Equally important, however, the relationship must be demonstrated and not merely presumed to exist. An empirical finding of correlation between competencies and outcomes is not adequate. One of the dangers of evaluation which adopts a simple technical rational approach, while neglecting the complex social context of administration, is the tendency to ignore possible confounding and mediating variables. Second, one must demonstrate that an evaluation instrument is reliable and valid in identifying the significant managerial competencies which produced the desired outcome. The issue here is that identified competencies must be necessary and sufficient for generation of desired outcomes. The danger is that operational models of administration implicit in the evaluation instrument may be misspecified through neglect of necessary competencies and variables.

While technical rational forms of analysis are intuitively appealing, limitations do exist. One limitation is that if desired educational outcomes are produced by a number of different factors working together, then attributing cause to any one factor becomes extremely difficult. Second, one often finds that it is not the simple performance of a particular set of prescribed managerial behaviors which produces desired results, but, rather, the interaction of management acts with additional factors (for example, faculty characteristics,

school culture, local context) that provides the determinant causal relationship. Where this condition is true, one may not "rationally" prescribe nor evaluate managerial competencies independent of the total complex of causal factors.

Developers of the evaluation instrument do recognize these difficulties (Holdzkom, 1986). It is unlikely, however, that the evaluation instrument, as developed, will be sufficient to overcome these limitations. This is the case for a number of reasons.

First is the assumption that identified function/role competencies exist as independent and discrete entities. This assumption leads the DPR to conclusions such that it would be possible, for example, to separate, identify, and objectively assess the planning function of instructional leadership apart from that of communication. Or that within a function/role dimension, communication for example, one may meaningfully assess supervision and implementation separately. Moreover, the implication is that all this may be done in an objective, standardized fashion with evaluative judgment rendered through ranking on a six-point numerical scale. While it is clearly possible, in some cases, to analytically separate ongoing action into various functions, roles, and implied competencies, in many other cases this is not possible. An evaluation instrument which presumes separability in all cases is methodologically unreliable and inappropriate.

A second consideration is with the data to be taken as evidence of the presence and degree of competency. Developers of the instrument correctly recognize that merely observing principals' behavior is not sufficient. They suggest using a variety of additional data sources, for example, documentary evidence, interviews with principals and other organizational participants. What is missing from these suggestions is any hint regarding the criteria for selection of meaningful data. Without such criteria evaluators are left to personal preference, data availability and tradition in the selection and interpretation of evidence. This may raise serious questions regarding not only the reliability but also the validity of the entire evaluation enterprise.

This raises a dilemma. If management of a school is a cognitive and creative act performed in a complex and changing environment, then it is very difficult to predict the type of data necessary, in any particular case, for inclusion in evaluation. To specify the criteria for selection and evaluation of data necessarily supposes a standard or image of superior performance or functioning

which predisposes an evaluator to search for evidence of these particular, typical patterns of data. Superior performance is, by definition, atypical. Thus, the use of criterion standards necessary to satisfy issues of reliability and validity in the typical case will also tend to suppress recognition of the superior.

A third point is that the conceptual framework, which leads to a focus on the competencies of a role incumbent, encourages the attribution of success or failure to personal qualities. This ignores even the most basic situational and structural constraints which may impede role performance and function. Within the conceptual framework of evaluation currently employed, it is impossible to incorporate these contextual dimensions in a systematic and standard fashion. If (as noted by Boyatzis cited in the Task Force review), job performance is not simply a matter of individual competencies but also includes recognition of environmental and job demands, then a conceptual framework which ignores the contextual dimensions will not prove adequate to the task of valid measurement.

Developers of the evaluation instrument attempt to avoid the issues of specification of decision criteria and the contingency of context by declaring that they are attempting to identify generic functions and minimum basic competencies. This is unfortunate for several reasons. First, school administration is not a generic act. Rather it is both specific and variable relative to performance demands (Burlingame, 1987). Second, one either posses minimum competency or they do not. To rank minimal performance on a six point scale and then interpret the ranking as indicative of quality of performance appears misguided at best. Third, it is a practical matter that evaluation instruments implicitly contain an ethical dimension with the focus on (1) asserting desirable behaviors or goals, and (2) compelling actors to adopt those behaviors or goals. Evaluation instruments, regardless of their intended purpose, typically have the effect of establishing an officially recognized standard of acceptable behavior. Thus to specify minimum standards of acceptable performance may produce the unintended consequence of lowering normative expectations of performance. This is particularly the case when standards have not previously been clearly articulated and consensually established.

Because a state mandated evaluation instrument is intended to affect administrative activities, the issues of substantive focus, validity, reliability, and ethics become intertwined. Simply stated, to influence practice, an evaluation

instrument must address significant and attainable goals that administrators are willing and able to adopt. Further, the instrument must be firmly grounded in a vision of organizations which is empirically accurate and facilitates more sophisticated understanding of organizational function and change.

We suggest that the vision of organizations guiding the development of the evaluation instrument is flawed. It is characterized by the notion of schools as simple technical systems, responsive to simple technical interventions. Moreover, it adopts a strategy of examining the function of one role incumbent independent of other roles. Because the concept of role is, by definition, relational and implies the interaction between role participants, it is most unreasonable to examine role function and related competencies as discrete entities. Even if one adopts the position that the attributes of a role may be investigated independent of other role participants, it does not follow that one may evaluate one aspect within a role independent of the complex of attributes which constitute the total role performance. That is to say, successful role performance is more than the sum of separate competencies that constitute the performance. Moreover, the ultimate concern is with the function served, not the presence of a particular competency. To determine functional outcomes, it is necessary to address the interaction between various identified competencies, all of which are conditioned by context.

If our critique has merit, one may be reluctant to advocate use of the existing evaluation instrument. But that does not diminish the desirability of appraisal of principals' performance. Nor does it specify the form a more appropriate evaluation instrument may take. If one were to substitute a conceptualization of schools as social systems and principals as administrators, then one would be encouraged to adopt a more social and integrative model of organizational structure and function. Such a model would encourage reconceptualization of the form of evaluation.

Within the context of discussion of the performance appraisal instrument, use of a social, integrative model would lead to critical examination of the competencies and functions identified in evaluation documents. Within the current evaluation document, no compelling rationale has been offered that the generic functions and roles so far identified are, in fact, comprehensive. Moreover, even if these functions and roles are considered to represent a comprehensive listing of critical indicators of effectiveness, then the issue of standards for judging

the appropriateness of managerial acts becomes central. The standards for judgment must include recognition of the conditional character of management. In this sense, effective school leadership is considered to be both reactive and proactive relative to school organization and environment. It is also an attempt to obtain desired outcomes in the face of often unpredictable technical, social, political, economic and value demands. The standards of judgment employed for evaluation must, therefore, focus upon the analytic categories and interpretive structures employed by the practicing administrator in the course of everyday activities. Evaluation of administrators thus becomes an analytic task in which observed actions and accompanying rationales are examined relative to specified standards of school effectiveness. Through use of substantive rationality, emphasizing goal determination and the exercise of judgment to attain those goals in a complex and changing environment, one may begin to reasonably assess the performance of an educational administrator. This approach facilitates evaluation of "functions" served by administrative action without the distortions produced by attempts to identify and measure fragmented and discrete "competencies".

SUMMARY

Performance evaluation of teachers is an emerging element of many states attempt to reform public education. The North Carolina Principal Performance Appraisal instrument represents one attempt to extend evaluation from teachers to administrators. While one may support the idea of performance evaluation for administrators, one may identify significant limitations to the evaluation instrument being proposed for use with North Carolina principals. These limitations may be classified as representing methodological and epistemological weaknesses. We suggest that significant methodological limitations of the existing instrument may be attributed not so much to what has been done but to what has been neglected. Specifically, the primary methodological weaknesses include (1) insufficient evidence that specified competencies are necessary and sufficient for production of desired outcomes, (2) neglect of the interaction effects between role competencies and role positions, (3) failure to specify contextual factors likely to affect role performance, (4) contradictions inherent in attempting to evaluate functions and competencies using the same analytic strategies, and (5) conceptual confusion regarding the presumption of superior performance on the basis of evaluation of minimal competencies. We attribute these deficiencies

primarily to conceptualization of schools as simple technical systems and principals as managers.

The principal performance appraisal instrument is described as grounded upon a technical rational model of administration which implicitly treats administration as a technical task, responsive to simple technical intervention. Consistent with use of technical rationality the DPR instrument attempts to evaluate performance on twelve administrative functions and sixty-nine competencies. Weaknesses of this approach are found to be associated with (1) the assumption that identified function/role competencies exist as independent and discrete entities, (2) neglect of issues associated with specification of educational goals and specification of criteria for selection of data bearing on goal attainment, and (3) neglect of social and situational factors which effect administrative activity.

Adoption of a more sociologically grounded conceptualization of administration as an integrative task linking consideration of the technical, political, social and value orders leads to more adequate specification of evaluation strategies. It is advocated as one means to encourage conceptualization of evaluation of administrators as fundamentally an analytic rather than a technical activity.

APPENDIX A

PRINCIPAL'S PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL INSTRUMENT

The following contains the instructions to the Principal's Performance Appraisal Instrument as well as the twelve functions and associated competencies. It may not be clear from the instructions that each competency is to be rated and that a summary of competency ratings are used to generate the function rating. The format of the original instrument has been changed to conserve space. Nevertheless, the original ordering and wording of functions and competencies has been retained.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Based on the evidence from observation and discussion, the evaluator is to rate the principal's performance with respect to the 12 major functions.
2. The principal is provided an opportunity to react to the evaluator's ratings and comments.
3. The evaluator and the principal must discuss the results of the appraisal and any recommended action pertinent to such.
4. The principal and the evaluator must sign the instrument in the assigned spaces.
5. The instrument must be filed in the principal's personnel folder.

RATING SCALE

1=Superior

2=Well above standard

3=Above standard

4=At standard

5=Below standard

6=Unsatisfactory

MAJOR FUNCTIONS

1A. MAJOR FUNCTION: Develops a comprehensive instruction plan for the school, including co- and extra-curricular aspects.

1. Identifies annual objectives that specify what the principal intends to accomplish in his/her school for the coming year.
2. Involves faculty, central office staff, curriculum specialists, parents, students and other resource personnel in curriculum planning and program development.

3. Provides opportunities whereby students can have appropriate input into the educational system.
4. Establishes clearly-defined disciplinary procedures that have been communicated to and are understood by parents, students, staff, and the community.
5. Develops a comprehensive plan for extra- and co-curricular non-instructional activities that support the instructional program, directly and/or indirectly.
6. Plans for appropriate utilization of community resources to enrich the school program.
7. Defines roles for staff members for completing tasks.
8. Arranges staff development programs that provide opportunities for professional growth.

1B. MAJOR FUNCTION: Implements a comprehensive instructional plan for the school, including its co- and extra-curricular aspects.

1. Encourages and provides opportunities for faculty, central office staff, curriculum specialists, parents, students and other resource personnel appropriately to participate in the school program.
2. Makes use of supervisor or administrative assistance to improve performance.
3. Provides in-service programs for personnel which enhance the quality of the instructional program.
4. Implements a student discipline plan consistent with local, state, and federal policies.
5. Approves and facilitates appropriate co- and extra-curricular activities that support and enhance the instructional program.
6. Uses community resources to enrich the school program.

1C. MAJOR FUNCTION: Supervises the delivery of a comprehensive instructional plan, including so- and extra-curricular aspects.

1. Provides supervision to promote staff growth and the attainment of program goals.
2. Ensures that each teacher has developed or listed instructional objectives related to the subject matter for a given class.
3. Ensures that teachers utilize student data in planning lessons and courses of instruction.

4. Monitors a system for recording student performance and participation in the total school program.
5. Ensures that the discipline plan is consistently enforced.
6. Monitors the use of the community resource plan.
7. Delegates responsibility for completing tasks.
8. Follows-up to ensure that delegated responsibilities are adequately performed.

1D. MAJOR FUNCTION: Evaluates the comprehensive school program including co- and extra-curricular aspects.

1. Evaluates the instructional program, using appropriate procedures and/or data to insure attainment of instructional goals.
2. Evaluates instructional staff, using criteria and processes adopted by the board of education.
3. Evaluates community resource plan, using appropriate procedures.
4. Evaluates discipline plan, using appropriate procedures and/or data.
5. Evaluates extra-curricular program, using appropriate procedures, to ascertain goals attainment.
6. Evaluates co-curricular program, using appropriate procedures, to ascertain goals attainment.

2A. MAJOR FUNCTION: Develops a comprehensive plan for resource management.

1. Prepares school's budgetary requests.
2. Prepares a human resource plan that reflects the goals and needs of the school's comprehensive programs.
3. Develops a plan for identifying needed materials, supplies, and equipment.
4. Involves the staff in setting priorities concerning expenditures for instructional supplies.
5. Develops appropriate work schedules, class schedules, building use schedules, and other necessary schedules.
6. Develops a plan for delivery of school's transportation services.

2B. MAJOR FUNCTION: Implements the plan for resource management.

1. Implements scheduled maintenance and safety inspection programs to assure proper maintenance of school plant and grounds.
2. Implements procedures for the appropriate inventory and distribution of materials, supplies, and equipment.
3. Monitors expenditure of funds and assumes accountability for all monies.

4. Assures coordination of the school's financial operations with those of the school system.
5. Implements appropriate work schedules, class schedules, and building use schedules and other necessary schedules.
6. Conducts fire-drills and other emergency preparation procedures in accordance with state and local laws and policies.
7. Uses community resources that support the total school program.
8. Cooperates with the community in use of school facilities for community activities.

2C. MAJOR FUNCTION: Supervises the plan for resource management.

1. Delegates responsibility for completing tasks.
2. Follows up to insure that delegated tasks are adequately performed.
3. Provides supervision to promote growth to attain goals of resource management plan.

2D. MAJOR FUNCTION: Evaluates the plan for resource management and its implementation.

1. Evaluates non-instructional staff using appropriate instruments and procedures.
2. Evaluates attainment of goals of resource management.

3A. MAJOR FUNCTION: Develops a comprehensive plan for fostering communications.

1. Develops procedures for receiving information from individuals and groups within and outside the school.
2. Develops procedures for distributing routine information appropriately.
3. Develops procedures for distributing special information appropriately.

3B. MAJOR FUNCTION: Implements the plan for fostering communications.

1. Disseminats classification, promotion, retention, suspension and expulsion policies, procedures and criteria for students.
2. Communicates academic and behavioral expectations for students to appropriate groups.
3. Communicates clearly-defined disciplinary procedures to parents, students, staff and the community.
4. Interprets and carriers out the policies established by the local board, State Board of Education, North Carolina School Law and the federal law.
5. Complies with established lines of authority.
6. Completes records, reports, inventories, requisitions and budgets.
7. Ensures that staff understands communication plan and procedures.

8. Uses written communication skills effectively.
9. Uses oral communication skills effectively.
10. Uses conflict management and resolution skills to facilitate school operations.
11. Interprets the school program, objectives, and policies to the community.

3C. MAJOR FUNCTION: Supervises implementation of the plan for fostering communications.

1. Oversees all special school events that are designed to interpret the school program to the community.
2. Monitors implementation and use of communication procedures.
3. Provides information and support to newly-assigned staff and assists in their professional development.
4. Provides information and support to newly-assigned students and assists in their professional development.

3D. MAJOR FUNCTION: Evaluates the efficiency of the plan for fostering communication.

1. Monitors and resolves any problems in the communication plan.
2. Evaluates specific communications strategies.
3. Solicits input from others about the usefulness of the communications plan.
4. Evaluates the plan in terms of its goals.

REFERENCES

Boyer, E. L. High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America. New York: Harper and Row, 1983.

Brubaker, A. The Limits of Rationality. Boston: George Allen and Unwin, 1984.

Burlingame, M. "Images of Leadership in Effective Schools Literature." in William Greenfield (ed) Instructional Leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Co., 1987.

Culbertson, J. A., Henson, C., Morrison, R. Performance Objectives for School Principals. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1974.

Duke, D.L., and Stiggins, R.J. "Evaluating the Performance of Principals." Educational Administration Quarterly, 1985, 21(4), 71-98.

Education Commission of the States, Task Force on Education for Economic Growth. Action for Excellence: A Comprehensive Plan to Improve our Nation's Schools. Denver, 1983.

Education Week. "Performance-Based Pay Systems for Teachers are Being Re-examined". April 15, 1987:1;16-17.

Goodlad, John I. A Place Called School. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

Hall, R. H. Organizations: Structure and Process. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

Haller, E.J. and Strike, K.A. An Introduction to Educational Administration. New York: Longman, 1986.

Holdzkom, D. "An Instrument for Appraisal of Principal Performance." State Department of Public Instruction, Division of Personnel Relations. Raleigh, North Carolina, 1986.

Kimbrough, R.B., and Nunnery, M.Y. Education Administration: An Introduction. New York: MacMillian Publishing Co., 1976.

Lyons, J.E. "Competencies Needed by Beginning Secondary School Principals." NASSP-Bulletin, 1981, 65(446), 59-66.

McIntosh, D. "Max Weber as a Critical Theorist." Theory and Society, 12(1), 69-109.

The National Commission on Excellence in Education. A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1983.

Sandefur, J.T. "Historical Perspective." in Whats Happening in Teacher Testing. Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Washington, D.C., 1987.

Shor, Ira. "Equality is Excellence: Transforming Teacher Education and the Learning Process." Harvard Educational Review, 1986, 56(4):406-426.

Silver, P. Educational Administration: Theoretical Perspectives on Practice and Research. New York: Harper and Row, 1983.

Task Force on Quality Assurance for Administrators. Producing Administrators and Curriculum-Instruction Specialists: A Design for Reform. Raleigh, North Carolina, 1985.

Tucker, N., Bray, S. "Performance Based Leadership Assessment." DeKalb County School System, Decator, Georgia, 1984.